3 9004 01508558 9

LP
F
5012
1895
G761

From Mrs. Peter Redpath
1895.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

England Scotland Ireland Wales
New South Wales Dominion of Canada Newfoundland Victoria
New Zealand South Australia Tasmania Cape of Good Hope Honduras Leeward Is. Labuan Zambesia Jamaica W. African Setts Hong Kong Fiji Islands North Borneo Falkland Is.
Queensland W. Australia Ceylon Natal Guiana Windward Is. Trinidad Bahamas New Guinea Straits Settlements St. Helena Bermuda Brit. E. Africa Sierra Leone
Cyprus Malta Aden India Perim Gibraltar Mauritius
HEAVEN'S LIGHT OUR GUIDE

Imperial Federation League.

The Case for Canada

An Address

DELIVERED AT WINNIPEG

BY

G. M. GRANT, M.A., D.D.,

Principal of Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

30, CHARLES STREET, BERKELEY SQUARE, LONDON, W.

LF 512 1895? G761
120 7358

IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE

IN CANADA.

President:

D'ALTON MCCARTHY, Q.C., M.P.

Vice-Presidents:

ALEX. MCNEILL, M.P., Ontario.
ARCHIBALD MCGOUN, Jun., Quebec.
HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP O'BRIEN, Nova Scotia.
Hon. SIR LEONARD TILLEY, K.C.M.G., C.B., New Brunswick.
Hon. J. S. CARVELL, Prince Edward Island.
Hon. HUGH NELSON, British Columbia.
Hon. JOHN SCHULTZ, Manitoba.

Treasurer:

H. H. LYMAN, 384, St. Paul Street, Montreal.

Secretary:

CASIMIR DICKSON, 15, Wilcox Street, Toronto.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE.

Chairman:

Lieut.-Colonel GEO. T. DENISON.

Secretary:

T. E. MOBERLY, 2, Toronto Street, Toronto.

BRANCHES.

Barrie, Ont.
Belleville, Ont.
Bracebridge, Ont.
Brantford, Ont.
Chatham, Ont.
Halifax, N.S.
Ingersoll, Ont.
Kingston, Ont.
Montreal, Q.
Orillia, Ont.
Ottawa, Ont.
Peterboro, Ont.
Pictou, N.S.
Port Arthur, Ont.
St. John, N.B.
Sydney, C.B.
Toronto, Ont.
Vancouver, B.C.
Victoria, B.C.
Victoria County, Ont. (with 16 sub-branches).
Wiarton, Ont.
Woodstock, Ont.
Yarmouth, N.S.

Minimum Subscription, Fifty Cents per Annum.

THE CASE FOR CANADA.

At a meeting held in Victoria Hall, Winnipeg, on Friday evening, September 13th, 1889, presided over by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, the following lecture on Imperial Federation was delivered by Principal Grant, of Kingston :—

Imperial Federation from a Canadian point of view means simply the next act in a process of political and historical development that began in 1763, when Canada—with the consent of all parties concerned—was declared to be British. From that day, the development of Canada from the position of a British colony into that of a British nationality has gone on steadily. The colonial condition is one of incomplete political development, and Canada has passed through various stages, each of which marks a greater measure of self-government than the previous stage. The various acts in the drama are indicated by successive civil conflicts always ending in constitutional changes that widened our liberties or by struggles against external enemies and influences that sought to interfere with our legitimate development. The making of Canada into a nation has been a long process, and the process is not yet ended. But if you complain of the length of time, I would ask you to give an example of a nation or a tree that has been made in a day. Mushrooms grow in a night, but not cedars of Lebanon. It took Germany and Italy centuries to grow into their present stately strength and unity. The making of France and Britain into nations was, in each case, a long process. The United States of America—with all their immense advantages and with the aid of nineteenth century methods and speed—did not attain to that condition of stable political equilibrium which ensures permanence and prosperity till 1865, or almost a hundred years after their secession from Britain. With us the process of making Canada into a nation must end in one or other of two ways :—either in clothing Canadians with a legitimate share in the supreme rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the Empire to which they belong, that is, in full citizenship, or in a Revolution

which means the gradual disintegration or violent breaking up of the British Empire. Canada cannot continue as a mere dependency. Clearly, that is impossible. No living organism can continue long in a condition of arrested development. It must grow to its full stature or petrify. Dwarfing means repression of life. Besides, who wants to belong to a nation of dwarfs?

This brief sketch prepares us for a definition. Imperial Federation, then, may be defined as A UNION BETWEEN THE MOTHER COUNTRY AND CANADA THAT WOULD GIVE TO CANADA NOT ONLY THE PRESENT MANAGEMENT OF ITS OWN AFFAIRS, BUT A FAIR SHARE IN THE MANAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMON AFFAIRS. As British citizens, ought we to ask for more? As Canadians and full-grown men, ought we to be satisfied with less?

I shall throw to-night's talk into the form of an interview between the audience and myself. It seems, from remarks that I have heard in different places to-day, that you would like to put some questions to me. I shall try to answer at least four of them.

I.

"WHY, IN YOUR DEFINITION, DO YOU CONFINE THE PROPOSED FEDERATION TO THE MOTHER COUNTRY AND CANADA?"

Because we are able to look at it from our own point of view better than from any other, and because Canada is the only part of the Empire outside the British Islands that is ripe for the consideration of the question. If you wish to get to the top of a ladder, take one step at a time, and begin with the step nearest you. Even Australasia—in my opinion—is not yet ripe for Imperial Federation, because it has not yet taken the step of Australian Federation. It is making tentative efforts in that direction. The Assembly that has hitherto met at Hobart means nothing more than an attempt or experiment. In other words, there are—including New Zealand and Tasmania—seven Australias, but there is no Australia. The making of Australia into a nation or a political unity is the first step to be taken in the Southern Seas, and that of itself will tax the supreme energies of the people for some years. So far as I could discern during a brief visit there, the only opposition that has any vitality in it to Imperial Federation comes from men who regard it as a red herring drawn

across the trail of Australian unity; and only when Australian unity has been consummated will the noblest minds—the minds that in the long run determine the thinking and action of a great people—be in a position to invite themselves and others to a far higher point of view. In the same way, South Africa has also to accomplish its own unification. The problems there are altogether different from those in Australasia, but it would take too long to indicate even in a hurried way the relations of British, Boer, and Black; or of Colonial Imperialism and Afrikanderism. This alone is clear to me, that the South African Colonies, Republics, and Protectorates must accomplish their unification and obtain Home Rule along the lines that Canada and Australia have traced and are tracing out, as the preliminary step to their becoming a partner in Imperial Federation. India, again, is the greatest Crown dependency. Its position is unique, and cannot be discussed in a sentence. Enough for us that it will have to remain in substantially its present relations to the central power for a long time to come. It is, however, well to remember, for the sake of those writers who tell us that Imperial Federation means taxing us and taking away our sons to fight in Burmah and Afghanistan, that the possession of India has never imposed financial responsibility on the British people, in peace or war; that India pays for its own administration and for the conflicts necessary for its preservation; that it has warlike races that could supply millions of soldiers; and that its possession has brought nothing but benefit to the Mother Country, to itself, and to the world.

II.

"When will the question become one of practical politics?"

When Canada as a whole is ready for it and asks for the change in a constitutional way. We have never obtained an extension of our liberties from the Imperial Parliament until we asked for it. If a thing is worth getting, it is worth asking for. And it takes a long time before several millions of people are convinced that a proposed change is a reform, and that the reform is necessary to their well-being. There are always two or more sides to every question in a free country. Extreme men must be heard on every side; and at last the sober judgment and conscience of the

country gets at the kernel involved in the discussion, and then before long that is certain to become incorporated in the Constitution. Look at our own history. Lord Durham's Report on Canada was published in 1839. There the idea of Provincial Legislatures with local powers, subordinated to a central authority, as the best thing for us, was first authoritatively indicated; although individual writers had referred to it previously. But it was not until 1865 that the legislature of the old Upper and Lower Canada adopted the idea; and even then, although the leading statesmen of the Maritime Provinces had long before advocated some scheme of union, the legislatures of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island rejected the resolutions of the Quebec legislature. In 1867 the Act of Confederation was passed, but so slow is the process of national unification everywhere and at all times, that Lord Lansdowne was perfectly justified in saying that the plaster on the walls of our Confederation was scarcely yet dry. It is dry enough, however, to permit us to live in the house quite comfortably.

In the meanwhile, one of the objects of the Imperial Federation League is to form branches all over Canada to discuss the question from every point of view, with the confident expectation that in due time our Parliament will feel itself warranted by public opinion to instruct the Government of the day to enter into negotiations with the British Government on the subject. Then will be the time to draw up a scheme.

Before forming a branch of the League, all that is necessary is that a number of people in the locality should have two principles rooted and grounded in them: (1) that Britain and Canada must continue to have one flag—in other words, that the present union must be maintained; (2) that Canadians are prepared for full citizenship—in other words, that they are determined to be the peers and not the dependents of their fellow-citizens in the British Islands. As to the particular form in which the movement may take shape eventually, we are quite indifferent. We welcome the production of plans and of criticism on them, but we are committed to no scheme. You may think my summary of principles rather bald. But Mr. Lincoln went into the greatest war of the century with only one principle as his pole-star,—"The union must be preserved." He carried that flag to the end, and gained the victory with it, smiling good-naturedly for years at elaborate schemes that wise men were pressing on him from every side, but

putting them aside, because he saw that the country was not ripe for them.

If you ask me for *my* scheme, I answer that I could draw up one or half a dozen, each more excellent than the other, but why should I do your work? Come and help me. Two heads are wiser than one. You would have some reason to complain if I elaborated a plan and then asked you to swallow it. Besides, when the time comes, the weakest of us could draw up a better scheme than he could now. Events are wiser than men. I may add however that moderate and leading statesmen are quite convinced that the idea of Imperial Federation can be forged into a workable scheme. Two of these met three or four years ago in a room in London and gave public expression to this conviction. The one was the present leader of the British House of Commons, and no person has ever accused Mr. W. H. Smith of being a dreamer. The other was the Premier of Ontario, and Mr. Mowat is universally considered in Canada to be a practical politician of the best kind. He admitted that there were difficulties in the way, (as there are in the way of Australian or African Federation or of any proposed constitutional change of importance) but, he added, with his usual pluck and common sense, "What are Statesmen for but to overcome difficulties?"

If you still press me for an answer to your second question in this interview, or at any rate for my opinion on the point, I say that I am a Canadian and that I am willing to wait the time of the Canadian people and to keep step with them. Admittedly, the question is not yet one for the mere hand-to-mouth politician. Its importance may not be immediate. It may be for to-morrow rather than for to-day. But, should not the statesman think of to-morrow? Should not wise men look ahead? It may take us a long time to get to a goal, but ought we not to know how to face, and to be sure that we are facing, in the right direction? When building a nation, we think not of the pockets of this or that man or the immediate convenience of this or that locality. We build for the ages.

I am well aware that in conceding so much, in admitting that the question may not be of immediate and pressing importance, some people will fancy that I have relegated it to dreamland and that I am simply a harmless hobbyist, or, to use the modern words that amateur writers affect, a crank or faddist. I am not afraid of the words. Cranks turn things. They can lift or turn

almost anything. Think again of our own history, of the history in particular of your own North-West. For many a long year, was not William McDougall called a hobbyist, because, through the newspaper he controlled, he urged on Upper Canada the acquisition of the North-West? He was told that the country was worthless, that it would be simply an intolerable burden on his native Province, that not even an onion or a cabbage could grow here, that the frost never came out of the ground, that axes split when men tried to chop wood in winter, that it was a country intended by the Almighty only for fur-bearing animals, and a great many travellers' tales equally reliable. I remember reading an article in the *Edinburgh Review* less than thirty years ago which not only repeated some of those stories on good evidence, but also proved scientifically—and science is infallible—that the geological structure of the North-West was such that it could not grow cereals! Now, everyone admits that the larger half of the population of Canada will eventually be found to the West of this Red River of the North on whose banks we meet, that there are no cereals in the world equal to those grown here, and that the future of Canada is bound up with the North-West.

This thought leads me to say that I consented to speak on Imperial Federation in Winnipeg with peculiar pleasure. To me, as you have already seen, the subject is all-important because its accomplishment means the placing of the copestone on that structure of Canadian nationality which we have been working at so long; and in the making of Canada I have always regarded this Province of Manitoba as the keystone of the edifice. This position puts on you a great responsibility. Remember that I am not saying this hurriedly or thoughtlessly, or with the idea of giving taffy to an audience. My interest in the North-West is not of yesterday. It is older than Confederation. It goes back to the famine which the settlers on this river suffered from, fully twenty-five years ago, on account of an invasion of grasshoppers that destroyed their crops. An old friend of this country, a warm and true friend, Mr. Sandford Fleming, was then in Halifax, where I lived at the time. He called my attention to the fact that fellow-subjects of our own in British America were threatened with starvation. That was enough. We called a meeting in Halifax, appointed ward collectors, and at once raised a considerable sum and had it sent to the proper quarter for the purchase of flour. Many years after that, in 1872, I

paid my first visit to Winnipeg. I travelled over the piebald and piecemeal Dawson Road, with all its water stretches, simply to find out whether Canada was doomed to end in Lake Huron, or whether there was a country for our children beyond the great Lakes, and all the way to the Pacific. One sight of the prairie was enough for me. We got to Point du Chêne in the night; wet, wearied, maddened by the mosquitoes of the marshes, and threw ourselves down to sleep on the floor of an unfinished building that stood some way out on the prairie. In the morning I awakened, and, looking out, found myself in Paradise. "A floral garden," as Mr. Maccoun called it, extended far away to the horizon on every side. "Yes," said an enthusiast who had joined our party, "you may stick a plough in here, and draw an unbroken furrow to the Rocky Mountains." That was a slight exaggeration, but on the right side. In the main he was not so far out. The question I had been asking myself was settled. And every day that I rode deeper into the heart of this great North-West, it was settled more absolutely. Beautiful was the prairie in those days, but more beautiful has it seemed to me all this week, as I travelled over the four hundred miles between this and Moosejaw. The expanding towns and villages, the shack and shanty giving place to the comfortable house and ample barn, stacks of golden grain out in the fields or flanking the buildings right and left, the reapers and the threshers, the sturdy yeomanry busy as beavers, the abundance everywhere, even in this dry season, for man and beast, filled my heart with gratitude to the bountiful Giver of all. But, even so recently as 1872, few of the men I met in Winnipeg had faith in the future of the North-West. Few thought of it as a country in which men could enjoy life. Speculators, indeed, hoped to raise "a boom" for their own benefit, but those who professed to know the country declared that there had never been a good crop even in the Red River Valley. But three men at least blew the trumpet of the North-West. These were Adams G. Archibald, the then Governor, Dr. Schultz, now Governor of the Province in which he made his home in its dark days, and Consul-General Taylor. All honour to these, and to all men who see farther ahead than their noses, who have faith in their own country, and who refuse to give heed to the moans of the pessimist!

I may say that never had I so much faith in the future of the North-West as I have now, and not in the country alone but in the

people. No country known to me has ever been peopled by a better stock. The cream of our older Provinces has come here; a people resolute, intelligent, calm, and religious. Good specimens, too, have come from other countries, and as a rule from climates almost as cold as your own. That is a good thing. Your winter is grand for everybody but tramps, and when they come they are not likely to stay. The deliberate and general verdict of the 150,000 people now in Manitoba may therefore be accepted on any subject on which they are sufficiently interested to insure from them careful study. I for one believe that the subject of Imperial Federation is safe in their hands, and that they may be among the first to press it on the general Government.

III.

"What are the objections to Imperial Federation?"

It will not be necessary to dwell on the important objections that have been mentioned in some influential organs of public opinion—such as the alleged fact that the secretary of a local branch parts his hair in the middle, or that several of its advocates part their names somewhat in the same way. It is a serious matter that a man should be called John A. Smith, instead of plain John Smith. Equally formidable is the objection that some vigorous writers have called Imperial Federation a fad. I may, however, note other arguments:—

(*a*) It is said that "*Imperial Federation would involve us in foreign relations.*" We are so involved already, from the fact that every nation has neighbours, and that we in particular are a trading people; only, at present, we are without a voice as regards the control of those relations. "We might be involved in European politics." We are so involved already, from the fact of our being united to Britain, only we cannot now use any constitutional influence to detach the Empire from what is of less importance to what is of greater importance, from the affairs of Europe to the interests of an ever-expanding Colonial Empire.

(*b*) "*We might be involved in war.*" We may at any day now, without our permission being asked. Ought we not to be in a position to give our voice for peace? Remember that the democracy now rules in England, that its greatest interest is peace, and that we ought to reinforce it against any influence that

might make for war. Ought we not to contribute our share towards securing the peace of the Empire and the peace of the world, instead of being selfishly satisfied that we ourselves are out of reach of war?

(*c*) "*There would be expense.*" I have pointed out that Imperial Federation is simply the full development of self-government. Now, it is quite true that every development of self-government has brought with it additional expense, but would we on that account have been better off under tutelage or bondage? A Crown colony has usually little debt. In the old days of an irresponsible executive the debt of Canada was nominal. Now our debt has attained to figures that are quite respectable. But would we therefore go back to the old family compact régime? The sensible question to put is this: Are there corresponding advantages to the increase of expense? As regards the debt of Canada, no doubt mistakes have been made. Governments are not always wise, and Government works are perhaps built and managed less economically than works under private management. But on the whole, we believe that we have got our money's worth, and that no greater mistakes have been made in Canada than in other countries.

(*d*) "*Our interests are different.*" Against whom, I ask? Not as against enemies, for two are stronger than one. Canada and Britain must be stronger than either by itself. Not as against each other, for in almost every respect we are complementary. The one has what the other has not. This objection reminds me of a conversation I had with a gentleman on Main Street to-day. "Great Britain," he said, "is degenerating into a money-lending country." That suits Canada admirably, for we are a money-borrowing country. We are likely to be in the same position for some time to come, if we would develop our waste lands, our mines and our other resources, and it is not a bad thing that the money should be found and also kept within the family. My friend's argument went farther: "The fact that Britain has from an agricultural become a manufacturing, and that from a manufacturing it is rapidly becoming only a money-lending community proves that it is decaying." I do not agree. Britain is still important agriculturally, and any one who has recently visited her manufacturing centres would see no signs of decay. She certainly lends money. That means that she has money to lend. In other words, she has prospered; and though I preach that "sweet

are the uses of adversity," you, I am sure, prefer prosperity to adversity. An increase of your wealth would not of necessity mean that you were in a condition of decay. Yes, Britain has prospered marvellously, and on that very account a partnership with her need not alarm us; but her heart and brain were never sounder than to-day. We have heard of "the decay" of the old land for a long time, for there are not a few "candid friends" who tell her so, and her own children consider grumbling their undoubted privilege; but somehow there has been about her for centuries a marvellous recuperative power. After stout Oliver went to his everlasting rest, England did decay. Charles II. and James II. were more than any nation could stand. But under William of Orange she revived, and when Marlborough went to the wars it was found how little her decay was worth. She seemed to decay again under the first Georges; but when did she stand higher than at the Peace of Paris in 1763? Next came the fratricidal war, in which she lost the New World that had been called into existence to restore the balance of the Old. Then indeed every one considered that her sun had set. But no; she retained Canada, and we are beginning to see what that meant. Her sons braved the long wash of Australasian seas and discovered a fair island-continent, on which already more than three millions of our fellow-citizens live, the most restless, vigorous, and wealthy populations under the sun. They colonised also the lovely New Zealand group; seized the Cape and penetrated—and are daily penetrating farther—into South Africa; entered India and gradually attracted or subdued its teeming millions of diverse tongues and races, and gave the *Pax Britannica* to all alike. They have taken possession of strategic positions and coaling stations all round the world in the common interest, in the interest of free and unfettered trade, and girdled every land and sea with posts that ensure the development and defence of a great oceanic commonwealth. While all this has been done abroad, Britain has developed at home with like stateliness of movement. Freedom has

> "broadened slowly down
> From precedent to precedent."

I tell you, almost with regret, that she is ahead of us and of the United States; that we have still much to learn from her; that in no country in the world is liberty so truly understood; that nowhere is it more necessary to appeal to justice and elevated

sentiment if you would carry an audience with you; and though she recognises as no other nation does the unrighteousness of every war that is not necessary, I tell you that there is strength enough in the old lion to astonish the world yet—notwithstanding her wealth.

It is only fair to say here that my friend's argument went further than I have indicated. He considered that Britain was bound to decay, because she had responsible government, and he greatly preferred the United States system, where, once a President has been chosen, there is a practically irresponsible executive for four years. If there is anything in this, Britain should adopt the United States system. So should Canada. We should at once discard responsible government. I have not heard of any such proposal being made, however. We believe not only in being free once in every four years, but in being free all the time. Our form of government is a continuous education of the people; and though it has its evils, perhaps Macaulay is right when he says, "for the evils of liberty the best cure is more liberty."

(*e*) "*We would have little influence in the Federation.*" Well, in the first place, we would have more than we have now. We have none at all now, except that which is indirect and conceded by the generosity of Britain. We deserve to have none, for we have not shown that we value it, except by newspaper clamour when the inconvenience of our position is felt. It is humiliating to read articles in our papers calling on Britain to send *her* ships, for instance to Behring Sea. I do not undertake to say whether ships of war should be sent there from Esquimault or not; but until we are able to change the pronoun and use the phrase *our* ships, we should have the grace to keep silent. Oh, but, you say, think of the expense, if we undertook to bear a share of the cost of the Imperial navy. Certainly, but if we go in for Independence, we shall have to build our own ships. Which will be the heavier burden, to build them at our own cost or in conjunction with the wealthiest Empire in the world? Again, if we go in for Annexation, we shall have to pay not only our share of the United States fleet, but our share of the pension fund. That of itself would be seven or eight millions (dollars) a year, as the total is over ninety millions—a good deal more, that one item, than our share in a British-Canadian fleet! Two or three years ago a Montreal newspaper made out that our connection with the Mother Country was only nominal, but when neighbours began to bully us for protecting

our fisheries, and to threaten war, the same paper pointed out that we were an integral part of the Empire, and that at the first movement in the direction of war the British fleet would destroy all the coast cities of the United States. When the President threatened non-intercourse, the same paper pointed out clearly that he could not discriminate between one part of the Empire and another, and that non-intercourse with us meant commercial war with Great Britain too. In other words, the present union is nominal when it suits us, and real when it suits us. We run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. There is not much dignity in such a position. It has hardly the merit of impudence. It is simply childish. Is it too much to ask the gentlemen of the press who discuss this question to calmly consider these two questions: Ought we to ask for the service of a fleet for which we do not pay a cent? and is it not our right to ask for a share in the direction of the fleet which protects our coasts and our commerce?

As to the amount of our influence in Imperial matters, that would depend on our population, our contribution to Imperial expenditure, the reasonableness of our arguments and the kind of men we grow. I think that our own history, the history in particular of my native Province and of this Province, shows that the weakest member of a particular organism may depend on getting in the long run at least its due share of influence. The Anti-Confederates of twenty or thirty years ago in Nova Scotia always asserted that the little Province down by the sea would have no influence in the Confederation, as Ontario and Quebec had ten times its population. Now, the complaint in Ontario is that from the days of Howe and Tupper to the days of Sir John Thompson, Nova Scotia has ruled the Dominion, that it gets better terms, local railways, short lines, ship railways, and everything else it asks for. Your own history proves that the Dominion Government "cannot check Manitoba." British Columbia has the smallest population of any of the Provinces, yet more public money has been spent there than anywhere else. In fact the only arguments urged against the larger Confederation are those that every one laughed at when they were used by the Anti-Confederates of the Maritime Provinces against union with Ontario and Quebec.

(*f*) "*An ocean separates Canada from Britain.*" That means, if it means anything more than the declaration of a well-known fact, that if there was land instead of water between Canada and

Britain, Federation would be practicable. But, though formerly oceans divided, they now unite countries. For trade purposes it is a positive benefit to have the Atlantic. Mr. Moreton Frewen puts this well, not only as between Canada and Britain, but with reference to the Empire as a whole, in the following sentences :—

"If I were asked to idealise an Empire which should include every economic and social advantage, I should take Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and although the problems connected with the inclusion of India are very complex, still the cash value of India is in proportion. The cost of moving a ton on a railway is about equal to that of moving fifteen tons on the water. Therefore a community occupying such points as Bombay, Liverpool, Montreal, and Melbourne, is connected for trade purposes under circumstances of great advantage, as compared with a community which occupies New York, Chicago, Kansas City, and St. Louis, with the districts intervening."

(*g*) "*Manifest Destiny*."* This is the last objection that I care to notice this evening. It is sometimes urged in connection with Turgot's simile, that the destiny of Colonies is to drop from the Mother Country as of apples to fall from the tree. I hope not, for what becomes of the apples? Again, it is pointed out that just as grown-up children go out from under the old roof-tree and build homes for themselves, so should it be with Colonies. Certainly, and the one point we always insist on is that—so far as we are concerned—the making of Canada, the formation of a full-bodied, distinctive nationality, is the first step in Imperial Federation; the first, but not the only step. For, if our forefathers have slowly gathered a great inheritance, is it not well that the sons should go into partnership with the parents? Is it necessary that they should begin life without a share in the common inheritance?

The Manifest Destiny argument is more than a century old, and if worth anything it should have been pressed home and should have weighed with us long ago. It was used in 1775, backed by Generals Arnold and Montgomery with a considerable force; but Canadians—though consisting then almost entirely of the *habitans* of Quebec—refused to listen. It was again used in 1812-15, when every conceivable effort was put forth to force Canadians to become free, but they would not. The United States called for 100,000 volunteers, to make the argument impressive, a force equal to more than a third of our population then, or the equivalent

* "Manifest Destiny"; absorption of Canada into the United States.

of two millions now. It was used by Anti-Confederates in 1867, but in vain. That was the time, if ever, when it should have told. Geography had vetoed the making of Canada. The proposed Dominion consisted of four geographical divisions that could not be united together by railways, and each of which was intended by nature to be a mere appendage to a corresponding state or section to the south. There was a measure of truth in this. But the people of Canada would not listen. Instinctively they realised that every nation must be ready to pay a price, must be willing to transcend difficulties, in order to realise itself, to maintain its independence, to secure for itself a distinctive future. They said, let us rise up and build. So they added to their unequalled system of internal navigation from the Straits of Belleisle up into the centre of the continent, an unparalleled railway system along lines where engineers and scientific men had declared that railways could not be built. And now, when the difficulties have been overcome, when every part of our Confederacy is linked together by bands of the best steel, when magnificent dry docks have been built at Halifax and Vancouver, when our coasts and rivers and lakes have been lighted with hundreds of lighthouses: now, when—after incredible toil and expense and faith on the part of, comparatively speaking, a handful of people scattered over half a continent—we have succeeded in building our nation's house, it is coolly proposed that we should break it into fragments as if it were a card castle, and as if the putting of it together had been merely a bit of child's play on the part of grown babies! No, sir; I for one will not do it.

The Manifest Destiny argument has been used on every occasion on which we have come into contact with our neighbours for any purpose whatsoever. Its use shows that they think a good deal of our country and very little of us. Our position has been consistent from first to last. We are a trading people, from our origin, because of our traditions, tastes, and necessities. We desire to trade with every one, and most of all with neighbours. No government could hold office with us for a month that did not recognise this. We have never put an end to a treaty of commerce, existing or proposed, with the United States, but we have made a good many offers and invited others. The only absolute condition insisted on by us is that of honour, or the preservation of our own fiscal and political independence. The position that we took a hundred years ago as part of the British Empire we hold still.

Some men among us occasionally speak of Secession. We have had an impressive lesson taught us in our day of what Secession costs,—what it meant to attempt to break up a great nation, even where its links seemed so weak as those that bound sovereign States together by a constitution that contained no provision disallowing the right to secede. That lesson prevailed twenty years ago in Nova Scotia when the Province returned seventeen out of its eighteen members for the express purpose of demanding a dissolution of the Confederation. Let it prevail still. Let wise men ponder what it means when they propose that a country shall change its flag, that a great people shall renounce their citizenship.

IV.

"What are the advantages of Imperial Federation?"

I have left myself little time to speak of these, and I am not sorry. I have treated the question from the point of view of duty, or of what is right to ourselves and the Empire, and I have no desire to come down to lower ground. It is not the time either to speak of possible commercial and financial advantages. That time will come when we have done the duty that lies nearest us. In the meanwhile, sufficient advantage is indicated, when it is seen that by Imperial Federation we would gain full self-government, and with it self-respect, and that only by this method would we gain our rightful place in the history of the world, the place to which all our historical evolution points.

I had a letter recently from your own Principal King, and one or two sentences in it struck me so much that I must be permitted to quote them. He writes: "The highest elements of character can be developed only where supreme responsibilities are felt." Is it so? Then what are we in this world for? Is it to be merely human ants or beavers, each of us gathering about him the greatest possible quantity of stuff? Or, is it that we may realise for ourselves and our children the highest possible ideals of character? Can we cultivate these by being false to honour; by causelessly breaking with the past and all that our fathers have loved and toiled for?

> "Where you feel your honour grip,
> Let that aye be your border,"

is Burns' advice to his young friend. The grip of honour is as binding on nations as on individuals.

The Empire to which we belong is admittedly the greatest the world has ever seen. In it the rights of all men are sacred, and the rights of great men are also sacred. It is world-wide, and therefore offers most opportunities for all kinds of noblest service to humanity, through the serving of fellow-citizens in every quarter of the globe. Let Canada ask for some emblem—let it be maple leaf or beaver—to represent it on the flag that represents so marvellous a past and present. Is it to be thought that we would separate from such a flag without cause, still less place our country in a position of antagonism to it? Think what it has always represented—personal and national freedom; civil and commercial, intellectual and religious freedom; righteousness in private and public affairs and the proclamation of eternal life to every son of Adam.

What keeps us from asking for full citizenship in such an Empire? Nothing but selfishness. To quote Principal King again: "Selfishness is blindness in all highest interests." Yes and he might have added, "and in the long run in all lowest interests too."

What do I mean by our rightful place in the history of the world? This, to be the link that shall bind into a world-wide brotherhood, into a moral—it may even be a political—unity the mother of nations and all her children, the great daughter to the south of us as well as the youngest born of the family. Mark it well, an independent Canada is out of the question. The days of small nations are over for ever. Of the few great nations of the future the English-speaking people is destined, if we are only true to ourselves, to be the greatest, simply because it represents most fully the highest political and spiritual life that humanity has yet realised. Break up the British Empire, and what prospect is there of a worthy place in history for any—even the greatest—of the parts? Bind the Empire into unity and we shall have solved the problem that Spain and her Colonies could not solve, though two centuries ago the future of the world seemed bound up with them. We have to choose between our right place in history or absorption, or a position somewhat like that of a South American Republic. Take your choice.

PRINTED FOR THE IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE,
BY CASSELL & COMPANY, LIMITED, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE

IN AUSTRALASIA.

VICTORIA.

President:

G. DOWNES CARTER, M.L.A., late Mayor of Melbourne.

Secretary:

J. NIGHTINGALE, Metropolitan Chmbers, 261, Collins Street East, Melbourne.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

President:

The Hon. S. J. WAY, Chief Justice of South Australia.

Secretary:

A. BOULT, 30, Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

QUEENSLAND.

President:

A. ARCHER, M.L.A.

Secretary:

STEWART W. HARTLEY, Rockhampton.

TASMANIA.

President:

Hon. NICHOLAS J. BROWN.

Secretary:

EDWIN JACOBS, Hobart.

NEW ZEALAND.

President:

C. C. BOWEN.

Treasurer:

C. HOWARD TRIPP.

Secretary:

DAVID BELLHOUSE, 238, Armagh Street, Christchurch.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE.

30, Charles Street, Berkeley Square,
LONDON, W.

President:
The Right Hon. The EARL OF ROSEBERY.

Vice-President:
The Right. Hon. EDWARD STANHOPE, M.P.

Hon. Treasurers:
LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B.
SIR DANIEL COOPER, Bart., G.C.M.G.
The Hon. HAROLD FINCH HATTON.

Secretary:
ARTHUR H. LORING.

Bankers:
Messrs. HOARE, 37, Fleet Street, E.C.

Published on the 1st of every Month.

PRICE SIXPENCE,

Or, Four Shillings per Annum, Post Free everywhere.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

THE MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE LEAGUE.

Each issue consists of 24 pages, foolscap folio, much the same size as those of the *Saturday Review* and the *Spectator*. The journal is a complete record of all matters occurring month by month in all quarters of the globe which bear on the interests of the Empire as a whole. In addition to Leading Articles and Editorial Notes, Correspondence from Colonists all over the world is made a special feature.

Obtainable at the Offices of the League—

30, Charles Street, Berkeley Square, LONDON, W.;

From Messrs. CASSELL & Co., Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.;
And from all Booksellers.